

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

At the June 6, 2002 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Laura Chappelle, Chairman
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner

OPINION AND ORDER

The following parties have filed joint applications for approval of interconnection
agreements and amendments:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Case No. U-11098 | Ameritech Michigan and MCI WORLDCOM Communications of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed May 6, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (performance measurements). |
| Case No. U-11178 | Ameritech Michigan and Brooks Fiber Communications of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed May 6, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (performance measurements). |
| Case No. U-11561 | Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Mobile Communications, LLC
Two applications filed April 25, 2002 and amended May 2, 2002 for approval of Amendment No. 1 (reciprocal compensation) and Amendment No. 2 (E-9-1-1 network systems and databases). |

- Case No. U-12036 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless Application filed May 15, 2002 for approval of Amendment No. 1 (E-9-1-1 network systems and databases).
- Case No. U-12886 1-800-Reconex, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan. Application filed May 22, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (rates and charges approved in Case No. U-12696).
- Case No. U-13096 Ciera Network Systems, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan Application filed May 3, 2002 for approval of an amendment (term extension, new reciprocal compensation appendix, and new intervening law section).
- Case No. U-13211 Ameritech Michigan and Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan, Inc. Application filed May 1, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (collocation) and application filed May 8, 2002 for approval of the third amendment (removal of bridged taps).
- Case No. U-13254 VarTec Telecom, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan Application filed May 1, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (collocation).
- Case No. U-13328 Ameritech Michigan and RVP Fiber Company, L.L.C. Application filed May 3, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (collocation) and application filed May 7, 2002 for approval of the Mi2A amendment.
- Case No. U-13386 Ameritech Michigan and Stonebridge Communications, Inc. Application filed April 29, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13388 Ameritech Michigan and Winstar Communications, LLC Application filed May 1, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on February 5, 2001 in Case No. U-12460 for Level 3 Communications, LLC, excluding the first amendment and including a substituted, negotiated reciprocal compensation appendix).
- Case No. U-13390 Ameritech Michigan and Synopsis Communications, Inc. Application filed May 6, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.

- Case No. U-13391 Ameritech Michigan and Excel Telecommunications, Inc.
Application filed May 3, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13392 Ameritech Michigan and Universal Telecom, Inc.
Application filed May 3, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13400 Norlight Telecommunications, L.L.C., and Ameritech Michigan
Application filed May 14, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement as corrected on May 24, 2002.
- Case No. U-13425 VarTec Telecom, Inc., and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems
Application filed on May 22, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13428 EZ Phone, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan
Application filed May 23, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement.

Section 252 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 252, requires that any interconnection agreement that is adopted by negotiation be submitted to the Commission for approval. 47 USC 252(e) provides in part:

- (2) The State commission may only reject
 - (A) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) of this section if it finds that--
 - (i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
 - (ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity;
- (3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), but subject to section 253 of this title, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its review of an agreement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements.

47 USC 252(e)(2) and (3).

The Commission concludes, after reviewing the applications, agreements, and amendments, that it should approve the applications. The Commission finds that the agreements and

amendments are consistent with federal and state law and are in the public interest. Under 47 USC 252(i) and MCL 484.2359(2), the services provided under the agreements, as amended, must be made available to other telecommunications carriers upon the same terms and conditions.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1992 AACS, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above should be approved.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above are approved.

B. Approval of the interconnection agreements and amendments does not alter the duty of the parties to comply with relevant federal and state law and past and future Commission orders and rules.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ Laura Chappelle

Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ David A. Svanda

Commissioner

/s/ Robert B. Nelson

Commissioner

By its action of June 6, 2002.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman

Its Executive Secretary

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of June 6, 2002.

Its Executive Secretary

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated June 6, 2002 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”